1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6 7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA		
8	YVETTE G. PINN,		
9	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. 14-cv-05724 JRC	
10	v.	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES PURSUANT	
11 12	CAROLYN W COLVIN, Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration,	TO 42 U.S.C. § 406(b)	
13	Defendant.		
14	This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), Fed. R. Civ. P. 73 and Local		
15	Magistrate Judge Rule MJR 13 (see also Notice of Initial Assignment to a U.S. Magistrate Judge		
16			
17	ECF No. 6). This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees Pursuant to		
18	42 U.S.C. § 406(b) (see Dkt. 26). Defendant has no objection to plaintiff's request (see Dkt. 29).		
19			
20	Title II claimant before the Court and obtained a favorable judgment, as long as such fee is not in		
21	excess of 25 percent of the total of past-due benefits. See 42 U.S.C. § 406(b)(1); Grisbrecht v.		
22	Barnhart, 535 U.S. 789 (2002). When a contingency agreement applies, the Court will look first		
23	to such agreement and will conduct an independer	nt review to assure the reasonableness of the	
24			

1	fee requested, taking into consideration the character of the representation and results achieved.	
2	See Grisbrecht, supra, 535 U.S. at 807, 808 (footnote omitted) (citations omitted). Although the	
3	fee agreement is the primary means for determining the fee, the Court will adjust the fee	
4	downward if substandard representation was provided, if the attorney caused excessive delay, or	
5	if a windfall would result from the requested fee. See Crawford v. Astrue, 586 F.3d 1142, 1151	
6	(9th Cir. 2009) (citing Grisbrecht, supra, 535 U.S. at 808).	
7	Here, the representation was standard, at least, and the results achieved excellent (see	
8	Dkt. 27, Attachment 1). See Grisbrecht, supra, 535 U.S. at 808. Defendant stipulated to remand	
9	the matter subsequent to plaintiff's filing of her Opening Brief, and following a second	
10	administrative hearing, the Administrative Law Judge issued a favorable Decision finding	
11	plaintiff disabled from November 11, 2010 through June 1, 2014 (see Dkt. 27, p. 1). There has	
12	not been excessive delay and no windfall will result from the requested fee.	
13	Plaintiff's total back payment was \$55,809.00 (see id., Attachment 1). Plaintiff has	
14	moved for an attorney's fee of \$7,952.25 (see Motion, Dkt. 26, p. 1), and on receipt of this fee	
15	will refund to plaintiff the EAJA fee award of \$3,497.10 (see id.; see also Dkt. 24). See Parish v.	
16	Comm'r. Soc. Sec. Admin., 698 F.3d 1215, 1221 (9th Cir. 2012).	
17	Based on plaintiff's motion and supporting documents (see Dkt. 26, 27 with attachments	
18	1-3, 28), and with no objection from defendant (Dkt. 29), it is hereby ORDERED that attorney's	
19	fees in the amount of \$7,952.25 be awarded to plaintiff's attorney pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §	
20	406(b).	
21	Dated this 11th day of August, 2016.	
22	The horof (waters)	
23	J. Richard Creatura United States Magistrate Judge	
24		